Single Bench (1)

18/10/06

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR(C.G.)

REVIEW PETITION **MISC.CIVIL.CASE. No.** 04 **/2006** (3)

APPLICANT PETITIONER	Manaharan Lal Dewangan, S/o. Shri Bhuwan Lal Dewangan, Aged about 38 years, R/o. Village & P.O. Ganiyari, District Bilaspur (CG)

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS	1. State of Chhattisgarh Through its Secretary, Department of Higher Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.)
	2. Commissioner, Directorate of Higher Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.)
	3. Additional Director, Higher Education, Raipur & Bastar Division, Raipur (C.G)
	4. Principal, Govt. College, Lalbahadur Nagar, Distt. Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

P.R. No. 3570/06 Dewangan...for
Presented on 22/11/06
dated

RECEIVED-COPY
22/11/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW/MODIFICATION/CLARIFICATION BY RECALLING ORDER DATED 27.07.2006 PASSED IN W.P.(S) NO. 3427/2005 BY HON'BLE JUSTICE SHRI S.K. AGNIHOTRI

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Review Petition No. 04 of 2007

Applicant/Petitioner Manaharan Lal Dewangan

Versus

Respondents State of Chhattisgarh & others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Present: Mr. Ashish Shrivastava, Advocate for the applicant/petitioner.

ORDER

(Passed on 19th Day of January, 2007)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. This is an application for review/modification/clarification of order dated 27.7.2006 passed in W.P.(S) No. 3427/2005 to the extent that a time-limit be fixed for the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner. W.P.(S) No. 3427/2005 was dismissed on the ground that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Lower Division Clerk, temporarily, for a period of 89 days and as such the petitioner has no right to the post and petitioner cannot be granted relief of reinstatement/regularization in service.

2. In view of the facts that the appointment of the petitioner was not in accordance with law and dehors the constitutional scheme of the employment.

3. The petitioner was granted liberty to make appropriate representation. The petitioner has come to this Court for

prescribing stipulated time, which cannot be done since the petitioner has no right to the post.

4. Thus, the application is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash